



1  
2  
3 PLEASANT GROVE CITY  
4 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
5 March 26, 2015  
6

7 **PRESENT:** Vice Chair Drew Armstrong, Commissioners Dallin Nelson, Amy Cardon, Scott  
8 Richards, Levi Adams, Lisa Coombs, Gary Yeates  
9

10 **STAFF:** Community Development Director Ken Young, City Planner Royce Davies, Planning  
11 Tech Barbara Johnson, City Engineer Degen Lewis, NAB Chairperson Libby Flegal  
12

13 Chair Eric Jensen was excused.  
14

15 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.  
16

17 Vice Chair Armstrong noted that alternate, Gary Yeates, would be acting as a voting member.  
18

19 **Commission Business:**  
20

- 21       • **Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Richards gave the opening remarks.  
22  
23       • **Agenda Approval:**  
24

25 The Commission was informed that Items 1 and 2 were continued from March 12 to April 9.  
26

- 27       • **MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the written agenda  
28 as public record, with the changes noted. Commissioner Coombs  
29 seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".  
30 The motion carried.  
31  
32       • **Staff Reports:**  
33  
34       • **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the Staff Reports  
35 as part of the public record. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion.  
36 The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.  
37  
38       • **Declaration of conflicts and abstentions from Commission Members:** There  
39 were none.

1 **ITEM 1** – Public Hearing to consider the request of Josh Winn with Georgetown Development  
2 for a 68-Lot Mixed Housing Development Preliminary Plat called Garden Grove located at  
3 approximately 15 South 1300 West in the Grove Zone. *\*Continued from March 12, 2015 and*  
4 *continued to April 9, 2015.*

5  
6 **ITEM 2** – Public Hearing to consider the request of Josh Winn with Georgetown Development  
7 for a 68-Lot Mixed Housing Development Site Plan and Phasing Plan called Garden Grove  
8 located at approximately 15 South 1300 West in the Grove Zone. *\*Continued from March 12,*  
9 *2015 and continued to April 9, 2015.*

10  
11 **ITEM 3** – Public Hearing to consider the request of Val Gibson for an 8-Lot Preliminary Plat  
12 called Karrie’s Cove Plat A located at approximately 1600 West 1100 North in the R1-12  
13 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. *\*Continued from March 12, 2015.*

14  
15 City Planner, Royce Davies, reported that a Fencing Agreement was worked out that had  
16 previously caused a delay. Lot 8 is slightly elongated and there will be slight modifications to  
17 the Plat before it goes to the City Council. After discussion with the City Attorney, the applicant  
18 learned that any minor modifications can be made by the City Council and the issue does not  
19 need to come back through the Planning Commission.

20  
21 City Engineer, Degen Lewis, stated that after discussions with the neighbor there may be a need  
22 to get the curb returned to the corner at the new intersection. There will be a small piece of the  
23 property that has sidewalk on it. There will not be any new lots created as they are only slightly  
24 adjusting the corner. When the plat goes to the Council it will show nine lots but nothing new is  
25 being created. The change is just for the roadway dedication on the corner.

26  
27 Vice Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Vice Chair  
28 Armstrong closed the public hearing.

29  
30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Yeates moved to approve the request of Val Gibson for an 8-Lot  
31 Preliminary Plat called Karrie’s Cove Plat A located at approximately 1600 West 1100 North in  
32 the R1-12 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The  
33 Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye.” The motion carried.

34  
35 **ITEM 4** – Public Hearing to consider the request of Greg Roper for a vacation of Lot 1 of  
36 Warnick Estates Subdivision Plat A and Lot 3 of Lewis Estates Plat A to create a Two-Lot  
37 subdivision called Lewis Estates Plat B located at approximately 1294 West 3150 North in the  
38 R-R (Rural Residential) Zone.

39  
40 Mr. Davies reported that the request would move the previous property line to the north. This  
41 would make the lots meet the minimum lot size requirement. No setbacks would be affected as  
42 there are no buildings close enough to the lot line. The request was determined to meet all of the  
43 zoning requirements.

1 Vice Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Vice Chair  
2 Armstrong closed the public hearing.

3  
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the request of Greg Roper to create a Two-  
5 Lot subdivision called Lewis Estates Plat B located at approximately 1294 West 3150 North in  
6 the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. Commissioner Richards seconded the motion. The  
7 Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye." The motion carried.

8  
9 **ITEM 5** – Public Hearing to consider the request of Russ and Abigail Fowles for a Conditional  
10 Use Permit to grant a Waiver of Protest from installing the street improvements on two  
11 properties located at approximately 4145 North 900 West in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone.

12  
13 Mr. Davies indicated that the applicant would like to make changes to their property including  
14 modifying a house and barn, creating a new accessory building, and modifying a second home  
15 on the property. The modifications comply with the City Code which requires them to install  
16 street improvements in connection with the improvements on the property. Any reconstruction  
17 or major remodel triggers this requirement.

18  
19 The two properties together are nearly six acres. The applicant would like to maintain the rural  
20 feel of the property and prefer not to put in the street improvements or to have a sidewalk in  
21 front. The property is in the R-R Zone which, means that the minimum lot size is currently in  
22 compliance with the zoning. Nothing will change with the location of the structures. The intent  
23 of the applicant is to maintain the rural aesthetic.

24  
25 Mr. Davies reported that in an analysis of what needs to be done and where the location of curb  
26 and gutter and sidewalk need to go, it was determined that the necessary power poles will likely  
27 be installed at the park strip on the south side of the property. The original concern presented by  
28 the applicant was that power poles may have to be moved, which can be very expensive.  
29 However, after discussions with Engineer Lewis they do not think that will be necessary. Based  
30 on discussions with Engineer Lewis, staff recommended the Waiver of Protest be denied.

31  
32 The applicant, Russ Fowles, gave his address as 4145 North 900 West and reported that they  
33 have a number of concerns. The sidewalk as it comes down the property curves significantly,  
34 which is how they irrigate the property. A new sidewalk would interrupt that irrigation process.  
35 The irrigation issue was identified as the main reason they requested the waiver.

36  
37 Mr. Fowles stated that heading south along 900 West there is no continuation of the sidewalk. If  
38 at any point in the future the sidewalk is continued they would have no problem adding their  
39 sidewalk at that time.

40  
41 Abbie Fowles gave her address as 4145 North 900 West and stated that the pasture fence is  
42 currently shared with the McAllisters and they all line up. All of the pasture fencing would have  
43 to be relocated to make room for the curb, gutter, and sidewalk. This would mean there would  
44 no longer be a continuous fence along 900 West, which is something they have enjoyed for many

1 years. They chose to put the new structures back on the property where existing structures  
2 currently are so they can continue to maintain and enjoy the field.

3  
4 Ms. Fowles commented that the reason there is sidewalk on the top corner of the property is  
5 because when the newer subdivision was approved they installed the improvements. It has been  
6 roughly one year since then but prior to that there were no sidewalks. She remarked that if they  
7 were making their property into a subdivision they would install curb, gutter, and sidewalk,  
8 however, they are only creating their home.

9  
10 Mr. Fowles stated that they want to keep the rural feel which is what Pleasant Grove has been for  
11 many years. He and his wife were born and raised in Pleasant Grove and would like to keep  
12 things as they always have been. He added that they are replacing the existing structures because  
13 they are no longer safe.

14  
15 Commissioner Adams asked how the irrigation will be affected for the applicant and if the  
16 sidewalk goes in if it will make it impossible to irrigate the field. Engineer Lewis said there  
17 are ways to deal with the problem but he could not answer with certainty because no plans had  
18 been submitted. Looking at the property, the curb appears to be missing all of the poles. The  
19 ordinance encourages a meandering walk so there is flexibility to work around the entry ways for  
20 the irrigation, however, there is not likely a way to avoid removing the fence. His  
21 recommendation was based on the fact that there is an existing walkway to the north that  
22 connects to the interior neighborhoods.

23  
24 Commissioner Adams asked how many children walk by the Fowles' property on their way to  
25 the school and if there have been any issues in the past with not having sidewalk. Ms. Fowles  
26 could not speak to that because they just purchased the property. Their own children will go to  
27 that school but they would not use their own sidewalk because it does not connect and would not  
28 be a safe way to get to school. They will cut through the neighbors' field to get to a sidewalk.  
29 She expressed frustration with being required to put in a sidewalk that will not be used.

30  
31 Vice Chair Armstrong opened the public hearing.

32  
33 Lori McAllister reported that she lives just south of the applicant's property. She commented  
34 that a sidewalk coming down through that area would be strange because it would not lead  
35 anywhere. She could not imagine why a sidewalk would be necessary. She did not feel that  
36 safety was a concern and added that five or six children walk this area to get to school.

37  
38 Greg Roper gave his address as 1294 North 1430 West. He stated that he comes from a farming  
39 background and irrigation was always an issue. He knows the area fairly well and believes that  
40 the location of the property does not provide access to pressurized irrigation. He was not in  
41 favor of disrupting the irrigation.

42  
43 Mr. Davies read public comments from a resident named Tammy who called the City and gave  
44 her address as 4189 North 900 West. She wanted to be sure that the road has enough room for  
45 bikes and pedestrians to be safe.

1 Mr. Davies read an email from Matt and Kristen Rutter who live at 4347 North 900 West. They  
2 expressed concern about the safety of children walking to school and bus stops. The road is  
3 narrow and frequently used by children and pedestrians since it connects to the Murdock Trail.  
4 The sidewalk currently extends from the Cedar Hill's boundary to the Fowles north boundary.  
5 They felt it was natural to have it continue.

6  
7 There were no further public comments. Vice Chair Armstrong closed the public hearing.

8  
9 Commissioner Adams asked if the applicant would be required to pay to move any necessary  
10 power poles. Engineer Lewis responded that they would, however, at first glance it did not  
11 appear that they would need to move anything. It was noted that the Murdock Trail is less than  
12 one half mile away from the subject property.

13  
14 Mr. Davies clarified that if a waiver of protest is granted it would mean they do not have to put  
15 improvements in now. However, it also means they waive their right to protest the City  
16 requiring them to put the improvements in later.

17  
18 Commissioner Richards reported that he lives in the area and can see both sides of the  
19 discussion. He also felt strongly about keeping the area as rural as possible. He noted that in the  
20 last few years new development has brought in more sidewalks. As new development occurs,  
21 the City tries to make improvements. He was concerned about the potential cost to the applicant.

22  
23 Mr. Fowles reported that many different things can trigger required improvements. Making  
24 changes to the home, for example, can require the curb and gutter go all the way across his field.  
25 Planting new trees for the orchard could also trigger required improvements.

26  
27 Ms. Fowles commented that it becomes very cost prohibitive for someone to improve their  
28 property and the requirements encourage property owners to subdivide their lots to recoup the  
29 costs of the improvements. Mr. Fowles asked that the City wait to require the sidewalk until it  
30 can be connected to a more useful sidewalk.

31  
32 Commissioner Cardon asked if the waiver is granted and then later they are required to put in the  
33 sidewalk, if it will cause problems to the improvements made by the Fowles. Ms. Fowles stated  
34 that it will not cause any issues because the improvements will be off the road. She added that  
35 financially it will be easier to put the sidewalk in later than right now.

36  
37 Community Development Director, Ken Young, stated that the request is for a conditional use  
38 permit, which inherently comes with conditions. One of the conditions could include the timing  
39 of a review. The matter could come before the Commission at certain intervals, and at that time  
40 they could decide to require the sidewalks or not.

41  
42 Vice Chair Armstrong commented that having the sidewalk will allow those going to the trail to  
43 not have to walk on the road. He noted that people who live in subdivisions pay for sidewalks in  
44 their mortgage.

1 Commissioner Cardon was concerned about the asphalt that Questar is putting down in that area  
2 because it will encourage people to drive faster because they will think it is a paved road and not  
3 a gravel road, which will make the area more dangerous.

4  
5 Commissioner Adams understood the intent of the City to eventually get curb and gutter  
6 throughout the City, however, he felt they need to consider requests on a case-by-case basis. He  
7 had concerns about the applicant having to move the fence as well as creating potential problems  
8 with irrigation. He was not overly concerned about safety in the area due to the lack of  
9 sidewalks. He felt that approving the waiver with a requirement to review it again in a few years  
10 would be the best option.

11  
12 Commissioner Cardon understood both sides but suggested the City start requiring the  
13 improvements now. Vice Chair Armstrong stated that part of the issue is that they will  
14 eventually want curb and gutter down both sides of the street.

15  
16 Commissioner Nelson understood that everyone enjoys a nice big fence and in the past he had  
17 been opposed to this kind of waiver, but in this case it seemed to make sense. He felt that it  
18 could be approved with a required time frame to review.

19  
20 Commissioner Richards understood the Fowles' concerns and liked the rural nature of the area.  
21 He also understood what the City wants to accomplish. His biggest concern was the cost of curb  
22 and gutter.

23  
24 Vice Chair Armstrong suggested continuing the item until it is determined if the poles need to be  
25 moved. Director Young stated that there would be some cost incurred to make that  
26 determination.

27  
28 Commissioner Yeates commented that it seems that are all in agreement that the sidewalk has to  
29 be done at some point. The question was the cost associated with the sidewalk, the irrigation,  
30 and the fence. It is difficult to make all of the changes at the same time. He was inclined to  
31 revisit the issue in two years, which will give the applicant time to prepare plans and be more  
32 financially comfortable.

33  
34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Adams moved to approve the request of Russ and Abigail Fowels for  
35 a Conditional Use Permit to grant a waiver of protest from installing the street improvements on  
36 two properties located at approximately 4145 North 900 West in the R-R (Rural Residential)  
37 Zone with the condition that the applicant present plans for improvements two years from this  
38 date. The motion was based on the findings that there are significant changes that would need to  
39 be made including moving the fence, potential irrigation issues and potential utility issues.  
40 Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye".  
41 The motion carried.

42  
43 **Review and approve the Minutes and Report of Actions from the following meetings:**  
44 **Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 12, 2015.**  
45

1 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to approve the Minutes of March 12, 2015, with the  
2 changes discussed. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The Commissioners  
3 unanimously voted "Aye". The motion carried.

4  
5 Commissioner Adams commented that on page 12, line 33, the speaker was Commissioner  
6 Adams and not Commissioner Nelson. The motion was denied and specific findings were set  
7 forth and he did not feel the minutes reflected the complete findings. On page 13, lines 21  
8 through 25, need to be reviewed. He recommended that the items be listed in the order that they  
9 were given in the motion, this does not mean that they are in order of priority. The minutes will  
10 be amended to say there is no priority to the order.

11  
12 Commissioner Adams said that in Item 2 he would like to add that specifically they did not  
13 exhaust all other options and that it had been one year before they considered collocating with  
14 the other tower. He stated that he made the motion and when he read them back he did not feel  
15 the minutes included everything he said.

16  
17 Commissioner Adams said that number three specifies the "health safety and welfare of children  
18 playing next to the facility", however, the intent was to say that it would be in the middle of the  
19 playground and that there was an eight-foot fence in the middle. He commented that that would  
20 be the only thing keeping the children from approaching it. It was not just that they were playing  
21 next to the fence, but having it in the middle of play yard is a potential problem.

22  
23 Commissioner Adams asked that they add to Item 5 the fact that there are no other elementary  
24 schools in the City with a cell tower.

25  
26 Commissioner Cardon asked that her comment on page 12, line 40, be changed to state that  
27 "collocating would take a 70-foot tower and make it taller" instead of "she did not agree."

## 28 29 **ITEM 6 – Training**

30  
31 Director Young asked that they review the R/UDAT report. R/UDAT stands for Regional/Urban  
32 Design Assistance Team and is a national program where communities can apply for a grant to  
33 have a mixed team of professionals come into their community. The team conducts research and  
34 does a crash course workshop with the community to help plan the future development of the  
35 community. That course occurred in Pleasant Grove in January 2006.

36  
37 Director Young reported that he began working for the City after the course occurred, but after  
38 reviewing everything there was a great deal of community participation. He felt there was still a  
39 lot of relevance in the document even though it is nine years old. Some things in the document  
40 were pursued by the City and some were not. He wanted the Commission to review the  
41 document to determine if they want to pursue any of the remaining items in it.

42  
43 The group of R/UDAT professionals returned after one year to check on the progress of the  
44 suggestions made in the report. Director Young was involved in the review process. A lot  
45 happened at the one-year mark, but the City was starting the process of updating the City's

1 General Plan. The General Plan currently has many objectives built into it that came from the  
2 R/UDAT report. The entire report was adopted as an appendix to the General Plan.

3  
4 One of the main objectives was to focus on the Downtown and Gateway areas. Before the report  
5 was complete there was not a significant focus on growth and development. For awhile the City  
6 did not want an interchange in Pleasant Grove, however, they later realized they were missing  
7 out on a great deal of economic growth. Once the interchange was installed a new planning  
8 effort began with regard to how to connect the interchange to downtown and what type of  
9 development was desired in the City.

10  
11 Director Young stated the focus of the R/UDAT report was downtown and why it is crucial for  
12 growth. Downtowns are the heart of communities and are important economically and are a way  
13 to tie the community together. The City created an Advisory Board early on to help revitalize  
14 the downtown. It is not currently functioning but the City was looking to regenerate it.

15  
16 The City made a number of zoning changes to the Downtown Village Zone that were guided by  
17 R/UDAT. The National Main Streets Four-Point Approach was also developed and included in  
18 the Downtown Master Plan. Director Young spent a week in Washington DC to studying the  
19 four-point approach to understand how to merge that into Pleasant Grove's plan.

20  
21 Director Young stated that the City has a booklet for situations where someone wants to build  
22 new, remodel, or re-front their building. In doing so, there are a set of standards and guidelines  
23 that must be followed. Another recommendation was to develop a Community Arts Center,  
24 enhance the Downtown Park, create new green space at the north end of downtown, maximize  
25 use of the Pioneer Museum, and build a new combined City Hall, Library, and Civics Center.

26  
27 Over the past five years the City has tried to design and provide a plan for new facilities in the  
28 Downtown Area that would comprise a Civic Center. A more recent proposal of how to develop  
29 those buildings in the Four Block Plan veered away from the original R/UDAT concept. The  
30 document also provides suggestions on housing, balancing pedestrians and vehicles, and how to  
31 make the downtown more connected.

32  
33 Commissioner Cardon asked if the Downtown Advisory Board that is hopefully going to be  
34 reestablished, will revisit the document to make adjustments. Director Young stated that that  
35 would be the goal. Director Young stated that the City has always felt strongly about not going  
36 for the quick fix in economic development but rather be sure that whatever does come fits the  
37 flow and feel of the City.

38  
39 Director Young stated that the Grove Area has not had enough significant tax revenues to be  
40 developed yet, but when that happens R/UDAT suggested setting up a financing mechanism  
41 whereby revenues being generated from new economic development can be targeted to  
42 improving downtown and building it up. The Grove Area was formerly known as the Gateway.  
43 Some major focuses include accommodating growth and change, planning and coding for the  
44 Grove, making connections and ensuring that parking, paving, and wetlands are well connected,



1 and creating neighborhoods so that when more residential or mixed uses begin to go into that  
2 area, that walkable neighborhoods are created.

3  
4 The City recently updated the mixed-housing subdistrict requirements and made it more  
5 challenging to meet some of the requirements such as needing more open space and having three  
6 different types of housing products in the same development if it exceeds five acres in size.  
7 R/UDAT also felt it was important to preserve the unique identity of the Grove. They felt there  
8 should be groves of trees in the area and the City should require green growth areas. This idea  
9 had not been executed but may potentially be included in downtown or other areas as well.

10  
11 Director Young stated that the “dark sky” concept was incorporated into the Grove Area  
12 ordinance, which basically means to shield light so that it does not shine upward. This keeps  
13 light pollution low so the sky is viewable at night.

14  
15 R/UDAT considers Pleasant Grove to be a unique place and the City should identify that with  
16 markers and entry ways into the community. The City was working on a bid for these markers  
17 but no final decisions had been made.

18  
19 Director Young commented that a list of tasks is recommended to be completed by the  
20 committee or R/UDAT team. Many items on the list were designed for the first year and  
21 completed by the one-year follow up. R/UDAT encouraged the City to keep the community  
22 involved and interested. Director Young felt they could do better at making this happen.  
23 Director Young felt that the report provided good information that steered the City’s planning  
24 efforts to a large degree, however, many things could be readdressed. He recommended  
25 presenting this information to the City Council for their feedback. He requested that the  
26 Planning Commission review the document and provide feedback on if they feel it is outdated or  
27 things they can begin to implement.

28  
29 **MOTION:** Commissioner Richards moved to adjourn. Commissioner Yeates seconded the  
30 motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

31  
32 The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

33  
34  
35 \_\_\_\_\_  
36 Planning Commission Vice-Chair

37  
38 \_\_\_\_\_  
39 Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

40  
41 \_\_\_\_\_  
42 Date Approved